ALCTS Technical Services Directors of Large Research Libraries Group
June 23, 2006
ALA Annual 2006
Marriott New Orleans at the Convention Center, Crescent A/B
<u>Minutes</u>

In attendance:
Jennifer Bowen (University of Rochester-guest speaker)
Karen Calhoun (Cornell University-chair)
Beth Picknally Camden (University of Pennsylvania)
Mechael Charbonneau (Indiana University)
Cynthia Clark (New York Public Library)
Chris Cole (National Agricultural Library)
Katharine Treptow Farrell (Princeton University)
Robin Fradenburgh (University of Texas at Austin)
Lisa German (Pennsylvania State University)
Nancy Gibbs (Duke University)
Peggy Johnson (University of Minnesota)
Arno Kastner (New York University)
Joe Kiegel (University of Washington)
Angela Kinney (Library of Congress)
Lee Leighton (University of California at Berkeley)
Isabella Marques de Castilla (Library of Congress)
Dianne McCutcheon (National Library of Medicine)
James Mouw (University of Chicago)
Michael Norman (University of Illinois)
Jane Edmister Penner (University of Virginia)
Sally Rogers (Ohio State University)
Cynthia Shelton (UCLA)
Joan Swanekamp (Yale University)
Catherine Tierney (Stanford University)
Beacher Wiggins (Library of Congress)
John Wilken (University of Michigan)
Robert Wolven (Columbia University)
Marilyn Wood (Harvard University)
Irene Zimmerman (University of Wisconsin)

1. **Introductions, announcements (Karen Calhoun, chair, Cornell University) cited the website URL for Big Heads: www.loc.gov/library/bigheads.**

Karen Calhoun (Cornell University) announced that Katherine English, ALA Editions, is looking into the prospect of publishing RDA in online format, to ensure the new standards for cataloging reach all constituents. She further mentioned that ALA Editions invited interested parties to a demonstration of RDA at ALA Midwinter 2006 and gave attendees an opportunity to share their impressions. A survey of RDA is available at: www.rdaonline.org.

Calhoun noted that Harvard University is recruiting a head of technical services for the Harvard College Library and a division head for technical services. A handout was distributed on these jobs. Calhoun announced that Katharine Farrell from Princeton University would be the incoming chair of Big Heads. To initiate the proceedings, all Big Heads members introduced themselves and Calhoun reminded all to identify themselves while speaking for the purpose of the minutes.

2. Election of Vice Chair/Chair-Elect (Karen)

Katharine Farrell said there was one volunteer for the position of vice chair/chair elect and then asked for nominations from the floor. There were none and all Big Heads members agreed to the election of Lisa German (Pennsylvania State University), whose name was volunteered, as the new vice chair/chair-elect of Big Heads.

3. RDA (Guest: Jennifer Bowen) (30 minutes)
Background documents forthcoming. Discussion questions: Knowing what you know about RDA today, will you recommend its implementation at your library? If not, what other information do you need to make this decision or to recommend implementation?

On June 13, 2006, Big Heads completed a short survey on implementation of RDA at member libraries, which is posted on the Big Heads Website at: http://www.loc.gov/library/bigheads/source/RDA_Survey_Responses-Jun2006.pdf. Jennifer Bowen, who headed this discussion, said her role is as the ALA representative to the Joint Steering Committee (JSC). It is her job to take the opinion of groups within ALA and put forward their position. She said she represents the member side of ALA, not publishing. In order to do her job effectively, she needs to hear Big Heads' opinions on RDA and would find these discussions very helpful, giving her a sense of where concerns are. She said she is also available to answer questions and that Katherine English is there to represent the publishing side. Bowen commented on some of the responses from the survey, which were compiled by Karen Calhoun (Cornell University).

There were a variety of responses, including some comments that recommended returning the focus on library cataloging needs in favor of other metadata communities. Farrell (Princeton University) responded that we do want to accommodate the needs of other metadata groups, because by so doing we can serve the needs of libraries beyond the MARC environment. Another comment was that libraries want to see more radical changes with RDA. Bowen wants to see more discussion on this. Her reply was that it is a balancing act between trying to propose ALA's position and understand particular changes libraries would see valuable. One must also keep in mind when talking about RDA that this an international effort. Resolving roadblocks in common practices in the U.S. is fine, but may prove to be more difficult internationally. Bowen asked what Big Heads needs from RDA in order to have it fit into their vision of the future.

Robert Wolven (Columbia University) said that what we need from the new code is something modular, that addresses what aspects of the code would be used for certain circumstances. Wolven said institutions need to have a code that is flexible and with basic guidelines, but also contains details not for the purpose of everyone following them, but to address specific situations. In other words, we need a code that can be applied simply. Bowen said that is the direction in which the Joint Steering Committee is headed, towards a simpler code. In fact, the committee has been talking about the equivalent of AACR2 concise. JSC has not made a decision on whether to develop a version of RDA primarily for metadata communities that has been

dubbed "RDA lite," but is going in the direction of providing more options in rules so libraries can adjust the required elements to fit their needs. There was some discomfort expressed in the survey about the number of options added to the code.

Catherine Tierney (Stanford University) agreed with Wolven about making RDA simple, because of training issues, both short and long term. She stated that libraries are going towards the notion of pulling together works. Libraries want to make sure hierarchies are in the structure of the code. She expressed concern about how radical ALA's approach might be. Bowen said that within JSC they have pushed the envelope for changes in the code and so have national libraries. There is a more progressive approach towards revision of the code. Australians for instance are pushing for a code that supports digital materials.

Arno Kastner (New York University) agreed that there is a general consensus that flexibility and options are good for RDA, but other decisions and policies have to be made. He asked, are we moving towards each institution developing its own options and would these need to be tracked? He believes that RDA is trying to label options clearly so institutions can go in and make choices on what decisions need to be made.

Joan Swanekamp (Yale University) added that she thinks people are comfortable with very clear rules. LCRIs were well accepted because they clarified rules. She supports a simpler code, so that other institutions can see research libraries have made decisions to accept the same options. If we believe in developing "cataloger's judgment," she said, this is an opportunity to do so.

Sally Rogers (Ohio State University) said that one of the concerns generated by people is the time it takes to develop the code. She asked if JSC is looking at methods for streamlining development of a new code so that it does not take so long to publish it. Bowen responded that JSC has come a long way toward improving the process and the online illustration of the code will help to keep it up to date faster. JSC is building into the code a flexible structure that can accommodate new data elements.

Survey results on the Big Heads website showed that nineteen of twenty-six Big Heads libraries responded. Fourteen agreed and five disagreed that knowing what they do about RDA today, they would implement the code at their library. Bowen commented that several of those who responded yes did so with a lukewarm answer. One person who responded yes commented: "On a practical level, we expect to have continued dependency on a cataloging collaborative, and we need rules for that and some precision for describing and accessing our most valuable assets for generations of scholars. We have some hope that the integration of the other 2 RDA parts into the one we have seen, as well as the online integration of the tools, will put us in an affordable place. I have more practical hope that this will work than I do for our ability in the next 5 years to afford and implement the wide range of magical tools that are envisioned to solve scholars' bibliographic precision needs. The biggest issue here is core-will 2008 be too late? And at this juncture we are not ready to scuttle the effort with a NO vote."

Bowen further asked if Big Heads libraries believe RDA is on the right track and whether libraries should follow the code once it is approved. Dianne McCutcheon (National Library of Medicine) expressed concern about areas in RDA that NLM cannot follow, such as major/minor title changes and the single record approach. If RDA has a flexible approach, NLM will adopt the code, but may choose to implement it differently. McCutcheon is also concerned about how the code will affect the cooperative environment. Bowen said these issues are ones that have international implications. There are international agreements with the ISSN centers, for example, so there are limits on how far RDA can go in this area without affecting

these international agreements. Also, the single record approach is accepted in the U.S. but not internationally. And there is not full agreement within ALA that the single record approach is an acceptable way to go. Bowen responded that RDA cannot tell NLM how to code its records, but there will be mention of coding options for other libraries in the introduction. RDA will also offer examples of what the single record approach will look like. Bowen suggested that Big Heads look at chapters six and seven on a technique called embedded description that might address their needs.

Wolven said his feeling is that RDA is not on the right track. Columbia University wants a more modern approach to applying the code. His institution is not concerned too much about flexibility. It is more important to think about what will be asked of vendors and publishers with the new code. These are much more important questions than what we will do within our own institutions.

Joan Swanekamp added that Yale University does a huge amount of original cataloging and will be depending on copy from the utilities. She queried Bowen about integration. Bowen responded that JSC just started a partnership with the publishing community on a joint JSC/ONIX project, looking at developing a common resource description framework that both libraries and publishers can use to categorize types of materials. This effort will inform RDA and ONIX standards. Publishers are also interested in what libraries do with authority control and are beginning to have conversations about this and building consistencies with metadata provided by libraries and the publishing community.

4.   Taiga Forum (Discussion leader: Beth Picknally Camden and Bob Wolven) (20 minutes)
From the Taiga Forum home page: "Advances in information technology demand that AULS and Assistant Directors need to develop new solutions, evolve to meet changing user expectations, and prepare leaders for the future. Whether we are in technical services, collection development, or information technology, we must develop a cross-functional vision that makes internal organization structures more flexible, agile, and effective" http://www.taigaforum.org/. Several Big Heads members attended the Taiga Forum. Update and discussion questions: What came out of the Forum that would inform planning for technical services? What is a "cross-functional vision" and how might library leaders develop one?

Beth Picknally Camden (University of Pennsylvania) led this discussion on the Taiga Forum, which took place March 2006 in Chicago, Illinois. The initial planning meeting was hosted by Innovative Interfaces in July 2005 at the ALA Annual Conference. As a result of that meeting, a steering committee was created. The initial steering committee consisted of the following leaders in the library community: Meg Bellinger (Yale University), Stephen Bosch (University of Arizona Library), Karen Calhoun (Cornell University), Gail Herrera (University of Mississippi Libraries), Linda Miller (Library of Congress), Robert G. Murdoch (Brigham Young University), Carlen Ruschoff (University of Maryland), Mary Beth Thomson (University of Kentucky) and Robert Wolven (Columbia University). The forum was an opportunity to discuss the future of libraries and how libraries can move beyond their borders, transcending traditional library functions and structures.

Robert Wolven (Columbia University) gave background on how the forum came to be, so as to better explain what it did and did not accomplish. The idea for the forum originated at a Big Heads meeting, recognizing that their decisions were not necessarily relegated to just technical services, but that there was a need to speak with public services and other groups. The forum was constructed to get opinions from a diverse group with common interests. Seventy-five people gathered who were assistant or associate

directors or deans at their libraries. The group was mixed in terms of their broad range of portfolios, coming from technical and public services and from information technology. One of the unique aspects that shaped the forum was that there was no specific agenda, but a general question of how to deal with the environment emerging. The members did not necessarily intend to come out of Taiga 1 with an "action agenda." Instead, the group used provocative statements (available on the Taiga website) to guide the discussion.

Camden covered what transpired, saying that networking was the most exciting part of the forum. She said she made a point of moving around in order to speak with different people. Attendees formed small groups that tackled comments 1,4,5 and 8 from the Taiga website. Attendees were asked to bring their institutions' current organization charts, which were posted on the wall. Many of the charts were very traditional, showing divisions commonly seen in traditional organizational structures. There was general consensus among the participants that institutions need to push change at the level of the user's speed, not at the speed libraries set.

Wolven said what was surprising was the "hunger" for this discussion. He was also struck by the amount of people that volunteered to do something further, indicating a need to be reactive. The challenge is there is not an agenda to focus on, he said, but rather a number of things to do. Columbia University he said is in the process of strategic planning and looking at new directions. What was valuable in this forum was hearing how something was happening in one area and how it affects other institutions. How do we, he asked, create opportunities to have these discussions?

Cindy Shelton (UCLA) thought the speakers were excellent and thought provoking. Her breakout group had a conservative outcome. The discussion in the forum at large was good, but challenging to keep the conversation going on cross-functional connections. She was concerned that she did not see recording of the minutes and therefore was not clear where things were going with next steps.

Wolven said there was energy at the forum and interest to have another meeting, but no decision on who would organize such an event. The steering committee will no doubt disband, so there would need to be a sponsor for such a meeting and possible participation by the original members of the steering committee to assist the process. At present there is no organization in place to do this, just volunteers. Wolven said Charles Wilts stated that ALCTS would be interested in helping to create a cross-functional kind of event as a follow-up. Wolven commented that there may be an opportunity with the RLG/OCLC merger to see how those institutions go about merging their organizations and to make observations and build an agenda for a future TAIGA forum.

Catherine Tierney (Stanford University) agreed that the forum was a valuable opportunity for discussion and that with a subset of institutions, perhaps a smaller forum would be more effective in the future. The difficulty of Taiga 1 was in trying to devise next steps minus an agenda. The group wanted to go on to next steps, but was unsure about how to go about doing it. She found the forum valuable because she learned about public services at other institutions and how those services impact her library.

Lisa German (Pennsylvania State University) said she heard from a couple of others outside her institution that there were those who felt slighted because they were not invited. She too thought about future next steps, since it cost a fair amount to send attendees to the meeting. What outcome would her institution and others with attendees expect from this meeting? Do they get just a widening of thought processes or something more concrete?

Chris Cole (National Agricultural Library) was not surprised there were no constructive outcomes. What he captured was the sense of how things are accelerating. By the time you get it right, he said, it will no longer be applicable, so don't expect a grand set of solutions to come from the meeting, but rather instead learn from the discussions. Hearing the discussions while not expecting answers was still enlightening.

Cindy Shelton (UCLA) urged Big Heads to take advantage of ALCTS' offer to organize collections and technical services directors for a future forum. Nancy Gibbs (Duke University) recalled that ALCTS is having its 50th anniversary at ALA annual 2007 in Washington, D.C. As a member of the ALCTS Program Committee, she is willing to help shepherd this effort.

Dianne McCutcheon (National Library of Medicine) said she would like to have action items come from another meeting if that is scheduled. What is it that we want to get out of this, she queried? Long discussions are good, but ultimately how do those discussions affect change in our organizations? In her opinion, there should be end results in what is discussed at a future meeting. Karen Calhoun (Cornell University) concluded the discussion by stating that the group would take this up at the ALA Midwinter 2007 Big Heads luncheon, to come up with plan for a future meeting if possible. In advance of the luncheon, Taiga 2 was announced for January 18, 2007 at ALA Midwinter in Seattle, Washington. Those interested in participating may register on the Taiga Website.

5. **Coping with "permanent whitewater" (Discussion leader Sally Rogers) (30 minutes)**
The recent announcements of the OCLC/RLG merger and changing LC practice for series access, together with the appearance of three new reports on the future of catalogs and bibliographic services," have stimulated a range of reactions among technical services leaders and practitioners, from enthusiastic support to strong opposition. Discussion questions: What trends or common threads, if any, do these announcements and reports reveal? What are the factors underlying the wide range of responses? In what ways have technical services leaders managed change at their libraries? What high-level strategic priorities do we see that might begin to be addressed through Big Heads and the collaboration of subsets of our institutions?

Libraries have seen many changes in their catalogs and the ways in which they provide bibliographic services. Many reports have been issued lately on the topic of trends in bibliographic services, said Karen Calhoun (Cornell University). She cited as examples her report commissioned by the Library of Congress on the future of cataloging, a document that has stimulated intense interest and discussion, and whose full text can be found at: http://www.loc.gov/catdir/calhoun-report-final.pdf. Indiana University also produced a white paper on the future of cataloging listed at: http://www.iub.edu/~libtserv/pub/Future_of_Cataloging_White_Paper.pdf and the University of California at Berkeley is also looking into changes it can make in its operations based on a report it has issued. Calhoun asked the Big Heads group to address the questions in this agenda item.

Sally Rogers (Ohio State University), leader of this discussion, said she focused on the first and last questions in the interest of time. She looked to attendees to fill in on the other two questions. There is a need for collaboration among libraries, stated Rogers, and a sense of urgency to do something. Libraries are coming up short as compared to Google, because they have silos which make it difficult to navigate. Libraries have federated searching but few know how to use it. There is still much duplication of effort and

an emphasis on unsustainable models. Libraries, Rogers stated, need to re-architect their OPACs, maintaining the backend function, but improving it. There is also a need for automated cataloging and metadata functions. Libraries need to reduce redundancies by collaborating on repositories, connecting with users and integrating library services with other information services. Overall, Rogers said, we must acquire needed skills beyond those typically found in libraries, while finding new sources of funding. What can Big Heads libraries do? Rogers maintained that this is a good time to look at these issues, especially knowing that new and improved processes will be proposed and implemented as a result of the OCLC/RLG merger.

Rogers continued the discussion by saying that OCLC is reporting that Google and Yahoo want more metadata for cataloging records. Libraries are streamlining metadata, but search engines actually want to add new metadata. Calhoun's report, she said, is a blueprint for implementing change. Rogers pointed to four points from the Calhoun report that support collaboration, including: 1) prepare for linkages in and out of the catalog and/or ILS; 2) innovate and reduce costs; 3) make good decisions based on data; and 4) find funding and partners. Rogers urged Big Heads to focus on one of these four areas. She suggested focusing on automation of cataloging and metadata and proposed that Big Heads form a subgroup to look into this topic using Calhoun's report as a reference. She suggested that Big Heads members use student assistants to build in focus groups to tell libraries what students needs are. Ohio State University has a project using students who teach other students to build electronic portfolios based on what they have learned from doing their research. Rogers would like Big Heads to build a similar focus group as an untapped resource. This presents an opportunity to influence the development of RDA, changing the rules to support a model that is sustainable. She opened the floor for further discussion.

Catherine Tierney said Stanford University is examining digital files to see what kind of indexing they can develop based on digital text. With some items under copyright, however, there may be rights infringement issues. She asked how other institutions are automating cataloging, other than working with publishers on providing ONIX data. She asked whether it is possible to get digital files for hard data and cited African materials as an example. Karen Calhoun said Cornell University has a number of ways to automate cataloging, including creating metadata from excel spreadsheets based on aggregators. Rogers suggested that vendors provide data that can be turned into MARC data by OCLC. Is there a way to streamline automated cataloging and metadata generation, she asked? What would it take to move that along?

Lee Leighton (University of California at Berkeley) said his institution has automated generation of order records. His institution is dependent on language expertise and has an incredible amount of records that need language experts. Dianne McCutcheon (National Library of Medicine) added that libraries need to categorize where problems are. At NLM her institution has used staff to get subjects of works identified, then catalogers complete the cataloging. She suggesting automating the descriptive portion of the record and have catalogers finish the remainder of the cataloging. Having a survey of what institutions are doing could spark ideas, she suggested.

Chris Cole said at the National Agricultural Library there is an effort to look at machine indexing using its own sources. There is also work being done with FAST as a machine-readable alternative to providing subject access. In his opinion, FAST is a much better alternative. Jim Mouw (University of Chicago) stated that information delivery tools are profoundly flawed. This is the reason why people are using Google, because it works on cell phones. He characterized present day catalogs as "tweaked 1970's generation tools." Rogers said Ohio State University is considering how to make its OPAC more responsive to current users' needs. This is an area where we want to guide vendors, she asserted.

Cynthia Clark (New York Public Library) said she thinks libraries can mine from catalog searches and analyze those in conjunction with focus groups. New York Public Library is analyzing catalog searches and finds that 80-85 percent of searches result in one hit. This tells her that researchers are xeroing in on what they want. In her thinking, libraries need to look more closely at who users are and what they want libraries to provide. New York Public Library is looking at a new ILS and will need to find out what elements are needed in that catalog to support users' needs.

Robert Wolven (Columbia University) said he believes there is a need for a subset of Big Heads to come together and focus on specific issues (e.g. streamlining/automating metadata). Calhoun thought the best approach would be to find someone who could take up each topic. Michael Norman (University of Illinois) volunteered to cover the topic on automated metadata generation. Jim Mouw (University of Chicago) volunteered to coordinate a group to look at how users approach searching in different ways. Robert Wolven (Columbia University) volunteered to chair the subgroup on ways to develop linkages to get from the discovery environment to the fulfillment environment.

Break

6.   Janus Conference Follow-up (Discussion leader: Cindy Shelton) (10 minutes). CCDO posted notes from their discussion in San Antonio at http://janusconference.library.cornell.edu/?cat+14 (the first link). Update: Have CCDO and/or other groups taken ownership of one or more of the Janus future actions? If yes, how can Big Heads members keep up to date about new developments?

On October 9-11, 2005, Cornell University Library hosted the "Janus Conference on Research Library Collections: Managing the Shifting Ground Between Writers and Readers," a forum dedicated to re-envisioning collection development in research libraries. Cindy Shelton (UCLA) served as a member of the technical services group for the Janus Conference and was also a liaison to the conference for Big Heads. Karen Calhoun (Cornell University) called Big Heads' attention to the two questions posed for this topic (see above).

Cindy Shelton (UCLA) confirmed that CCDO has indeed taken ownership of the Janus Group. At ALA Midwinter 2006, CCDO held a session as a follow-up to the 2005 event, with breakout groups organized to define the six charges stemming from the conference. Cindy Shelton (UCLA) formed a starter steering group that has expanded in the last six months to more CCDO members and other organizations that should be at the table, including ARL, CLIR and CRL, as well as nine or ten CCDO members. In the last 6 months, the group has tried to provide leadership for the individual goals. CCDO wants to create working groups around the Janus challenges. For more information on the six challenges the plenary session identified for the future of collection development, consult:
http://www.library.cornell.edu/janusconference/januskeys.html.

The Janus Conference steering committee met by conference call and during the conference, with the view that strategies will go forward with like-minded coalitions surrounding them. CCDO wants to open up participation and wants to hear how Big Heads would like to be a part of this process. The group must construct a blog, select co-chairs for the Janus challenges and have next steps for the challenges that will be reported out at ALA Annual 2007. Most of the discussion at ALA Annual 2007 will be devoted to those

challenges. The group is making good progress on three of the challenges, while two more need further discussion, and another is floundering and requires more attention. There are representatives from scholarly publishing also on the steering committee.

The three topics where progress has been made are: 1) recon (converting the scholarly record), also an opportunity for CLIR to provide support to create a working group to develop and begin implementing a plan for a national mass digitization project to convert holdings in North American research libraries; 2) procon, or ensuring objects published in the future are available in digital form; and 3) archiving, a challenge that is also taking direction to assure access to information resources over time. Shelton concluded the discussion by announcing that Cornell University will get the blog in place on its Website and will include on the site an updated list of steering members and a description of the action items.

7. Vendor cataloging discussions (Discussion leaders: Karen Calhoun and Beacher Wiggins) (20 minutes). Round robin on new developments and conversations under way to obtain catalog records for North American libraries from vendors. Discussion questions: What constitutes sufficient and acceptable vendor cataloging? How might key stakeholders (LC, research libraries, OCLC, vendors) best communicate news, plans and decisions with the library community?

Karen Calhoun (Cornell University) shared an agenda for a meeting that took place at Library of Congress on April 17, 2006. She briefly summarized the contents of that meeting and asked that Beacher Wiggins (Library of Congress) explain how the group asked for a coalition to be formed as a result of the meeting. Wiggins chaired the meeting, which was facilitated by Calhoun and attended by Katharine Farrell (Princeton University), Arno Kastner (New York University), Angela Kinney, Susan Morris (recorder) and Donald Panzera (Library of Congress), Lee Leighton (University of California at Berkeley), Roxanne Sellberg (Northwestern University) and Robert Wolven (Columbia University). The group considered three issues: 1) what constitutes sufficient and acceptable vendor cataloging; 2) what are the expectations of the Library of Congress in its role as the national bibliographic agency for the United States? How are other stakeholder groups to be engaged in the national bibliographic agency's decision-making?; and 3) what to do next: what should be the strategic direction for vendor cataloging?

During the meeting, Lee Leighton described University of California at Berkeley's projects with Marcnow, a company with offices in the U.S., India and Russia, that provides innovative cataloging and IT services designed for libraries and other content management companies. In Susan Morris' notes, Leighton summarized the project by saying: "Berkeley plans to have Marcnow catalog its receipts acquired through Harrassowitz. Marcnow performs Berkeley's Slavic, Arabic, and Persian cataloging and will soon begin cataloging its South Asian materials. The cataloging is performed from surrogates by retired catalogers from the Library of Congress overseas office in New Delhi, or by native speakers of Slavic languages who live in that city. The New Delhi catalogers communicate with Berkeley via email and conference calls as needed. The bibliographic records, which are encoded at level "K," contain up to three subject headings as appropriate and include call numbers shelflisted against Berkeley's local catalog. All access points are checked against authority files, and new descriptive access points are formulated according to AACR2, but no authority records are made or updated. (Berkeley has a separate post-cataloging authority workstream.) Marcnow catalogs for Berkeley in OCLC, using Berkeley's account; thus, the Marcnow records stream into Berkeley's catalog as part of its daily OCLC file. To date, Marcnow has cleared several thousand titles from Berkeley's recent backlog of Slavic, Arabic, and Persian materials. Dena Schoen, who was a serial

cataloger at Berkeley, has become the U.S. West Coast regional manager for Harrassowitz. In a pilot project to begin this summer, Marcnow will catalog the books that Harrassowitz supplies to Berkeley; Marcnow will not charge Berkeley for records produced in the pilot. Detailed arrangements remain to be worked out. "

Robert Wolven reported on conversations Columbia University has had with Aux Amateurs de Livres, to investigate the vendor cataloging a backlog of Columbia's current French materials constituting about 800 to 1000 titles. So far Aux Amateurs has sent Columbia a sample of bibliographic records they have created for examination.

Beacher Wiggins (Library of Congress) talked about the Casalini Libri Shelf-Ready Pilot Project, noting that LC will continue for a third year since 2004 to license shelf-ready LC core-level cataloging records from the Italian vendor, and that Casalini will continue to perform the associated authority work. The expectation is that Library of Congress will invest the same amount of funding in 2007 as was dedicated to the project in 2006. Donald Panzera (Library of Congress) discussed conversations that LC is having with the Deutsche Bibliothek on a proposal to exchange bibliographic records for electronic serials. The group as a whole noted that exchanging records with national libraries could potentially be less expensive than record exchange with commercial entities.

Beacher Wiggins also made mention of another shelf-ready pilot project that Library of Congress entered into in 2006 with the Japanese vendor Kinokuniya. Kinokuniya is currently providing Library of Congress with LC core-level vendor records, which it produces directly on OCLC using an LC account. Library of Congress staff are used to review and provide feedback on the vendor's cataloging until it can be declared independent.

On the topic of sufficient and acceptable cataloging, Calhoun said, the large issue from the meeting was authority control and its practices. Calhoun suggested at the meeting that the group consider what data elements would provide sufficient and acceptable cataloging and three issues emerged: The first, indexing, the group saw as the biggest gap in thinking, between the extent of authority control research libraries are willing to live with and what libraries such as Library of Congress provide. Wiggins emphasized his view of authority control as an essential element of cataloging that must be provided by a national bibliographic agency such as the Library of Congress. Others considered consistency of headings in the catalog is important, but did not consider separate authority records a general requirement for necessary and sufficient cataloging. Another element that most considered important in providing acceptable cataloging is the ability to browse. Lee Leighton (University of California at Berkeley) said many rely on key words in browsing, making controlled access points less important in today's method of searching. The third element that all agreed is important in providing sufficient and acceptable cataloging is retrieval. Robert Wolven (Columbia University) said that most utilize Google as the entry point for searching, thereby requiring more metadata elements to identify items and their locations. Wolven stated that since the number of authors who have only one publication in the catalog is 60 percent or more, much of the effort of creating conventional authority records is wasted.

Also discussed at the meeting was not only the need to define the Library of Congress as a national bibliographic manager, but also as a change manager, assuming LC will be a leader in the digital era. The group discussed development of a task force, which would craft a communications plan to keep stakeholders informed of the task force's activities. The final portion of the meeting was spent discussing how and when

the task force would be formed and who would participate. Possible participants should include research libraries, vendors, the publishing community, representatives from search engines, the public utilities and members of ARL and ALCTS.

As tangible next steps, the group identified a mechanism for continuing to reach out to possible participants to tackle problems discussed at this meeting. A decision was made to form a task force to tackle issues that came out of the minutes of the meeting and have four groups that would focus on four areas that need attention. The first group will identify the core element set for vendor cataloging that could be incorporated into libraries' workstreams and what the ideal workflow would look like. The second subgroup will give attention to re-purposing records from national libraries as part of an outreach mechanism. The third subgroup will draft a short, three-page, succinct white paper including advocacy for catalog end users, and will present the key issues of the communications plan. Finally, subgroup four will look into what are the pricing/distribution models that work well for all participants. Tied into this will be authority control needed for this model. Wiggins said he wants to make sure that there is no duplication between what the Taiga group does and what this task force does. All of the individual working groups will share their reports to the larger Big Heads group.

Cindy Shelton (UCLA) asked Wiggins if he wanted to keep the task force within Big Heads. Wiggins replied that he wanted to use Big Heads as the sounding board to keep the discussion of the task force on focus. Sally Rogers said Ohio University's Link Consortium has done some work on defining core elements for vendor records. Karen Smith-Yoshimura (OCLC/RLG) commented from the audience that she had received a number of concerns from ARLIS and the art community about Casalini Libri vendor records. She asked that those communities be represented on the task force. Jim Mouw (University of Chicago) said one of the important issues is that more libraries need to get involved in this effort. He urged representatives from libraries that do not have vendors they work with to join the task force. Mechael Charbonneau (Indiana University) said her institution is using Casalini Libri records and has set up a project with Springer where they are getting chapter information. Lee Leighton (University of California at Berkeley) asked that law librarians get involved with purchasing records and developing data elements for them.

Nancy Gibbs (Duke University) asked how an institution goes about getting in contact with the vendor to address backlogs at individual libraries. She hopes that Big Heads goes beyond the Western European languages in using vendor records. Catherine Tierney (Stanford University) said that many institutions with backlogs are approaching the vendors themselves and the vendors are interested because Big Heads libraries have approached them. Karen Calhoun (Cornell University) suggested that when libraries approach vendors, they keep the big picture of the library community in mind, as well as their own individual library's purposes.

Robert Wolven (Columbia University) said there is a need to move quickly and not overburden the process, and to be mindful of the possibilities raised, but not to try to solve it all in the short term. The real issues are not what elements are needed in the records, but how much is the cost, how are the elements used and what is a practical solution for a fairly large group of libraries. If the record is too minimal, there will not be buy in and if too long, it may be too expensive for all to afford. An audience member commented that another aspect of the discussion is what OCLC does with these records that are placed in their online system and whether they are overlaid by higher level records. Chris Cole (National Agricultural Library) said in looking at pricing and sustainability elements, there is a question as to whether the utilities' model is viable.

8. Report from the Membership Task Force TF Leader: Lisa German (20 minutes).
2006 is the TS Big Heads membership evaluation year. Discuss and act on the report from the Membership Task Force appointed at the San Antonio meeting.

Lisa German (Pennsylvania State University) reminded Big Heads that the group must review its membership to bring about the following results: reasonable continuity, a selection process that is fair and a membership that is not too overburdened. At the ALA Midwinter Conference 2006, the Big Heads committee was charged to review membership criteria in light of Stanford's withdrawal from ARL, the lack of participation among Canadian libraries and to bring a recommendation to the discussion group at the annual ALA meeting in June, 2006. Beth Picknally Camden (University of Pennsylvania), Robin Fradenburgh (University of Texas at Austin), Lee Leighton (University of California at Berkeley) and German, members of the committee reviewing membership, consulted the charges of the ACRL-University Libraries Section Public Services Directors of Large Research Libraries Discussion Group's membership, along with the ALCTS' Chief Collection Development Officers Discussion Group, to formulate answers on Big Heads' membership.

Recommendations of the committee were that membership should stay with the top twenty-four ranked ARL libraries, to continue to use the ARL membership criteria index averaged over three years and to recalculate membership every three years. The committee recommended to define standing members as follows: 1) National Libraries, including Library of Congress, the National Agricultural Library and the National Library of Medicine; 2) Public Libraries, which are members of ARL and whose ARL statistical data places them within the range of the top 24 ranked university libraries; and 3) other standing members who may be determined by the group.

Other recommendations were to move Stanford from regular membership to the list of standing membership and to invite Boston Public Library to become a standing member. Boston Public Library has previously asked about membership in Big Heads, is a member of ARL and is of a size similar to other Big Heads members. The committee finally recommended to continue to invite Canadian libraries when they are ranked in the top 24 ARL libraries, and to maintain their membership to the Big Heads listserv. Big Heads members also suggested developing a roster of members that would be posted on the Big Heads and ALA websites, to use as a contact list for the future. Karen Calhoun (Cornell University) thanked the committee for its good work.

9. Wrap-up and discussion of future topics (10 minutes)

Mindful of the time, Calhoun asked to hold this topic for future discussion, and for Big Heads members to post their agenda items on the listserv.